



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE SENTENCE-QUESTION IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

Concluding Paper.

G. QUESTIONS WITHOUT A PARTICLE HAVING THE VERB NEAR THE BEGINNING.

In the preceding divisions have been given all the varieties of question which are marked by a distinct relation to the preceding sentence or by the presence of some single word having interrogative or partially interrogative functions. The questions which remain can be distinguished only by peculiarities of order.

For an exhaustive classification it would no doubt be necessary to consider all possible variations from the so-called normal order, especially in the case of pronouns, personal and demonstrative. But the instances would be few in number and the results slight, and I have thought it sufficient to make two divisions according as the verb does or does not retain its normal position at the end of the sentence. A third division might be made of those sentences which consist only of the verb, but most of these have already been given under IV C, *rogas, negas*, etc.

Under the head of sentences in which the verb is near the beginning are included all with *at, sed*, etc., and those in which a subordinate clause precedes the main clause, if it seems clear that the questioning begins only with the main clause. Absolute precision is impossible, e. g. Eun. 705 and 951 are classed here.

As these sentences are similar, except for the absence of the particle, to those in which *ne* is appended to the verb, a comparison of the two kinds may be expected to shed light upon the uses of *ne*, and perhaps upon the origin of the interrogative sentence.

Indic. pres., 1st pers. Andr. 423, *sum verus?* is the only case of *sum*. Eugraph. seems to take it as a declarative sentence (id est 'vera dico'), like the Engl. "I told you so!" As a question it is parallel to Rud. 865, *sumne ibi?* with strong *nonne* effect. Eun. 532, *dico ego mi insidias fieri?* refers back to 507 ff. and means "Am I not right in saying that they are plotting against me?" That is, it has a distinct *nonne* effect; cf. Amph. 433, *vincon*

argumentis, te non esse Sosiam? In other passages the pres. has fut. sense: Most. 774, *eon?* *voco huc hominem?* || *i voca*, is really only one question, *eon, voco*; Poen. 1224, *pergo etiam temptare?* is confused in the MSS and the text is entirely uncertain; Most. 848, *ergo eo igitur sine perductore?* || *i, licet*, is also confused and is generally printed with a period; Ph. 737, *quid ago?* || . . . || *adeo, maneo, dum haec quae loquitur magis cognosco?* (MSS exc. A have *adeon an*). With *ne* there are six cases parallel to these. Cist. 288 Uss., And. 500 Speng. I should print with a period. Pl. [3], Ter. 2 [3].

Indic. pres., 2d pers., in alphabetical order. Hec. 458, *advenis modo?* "Just come?" is a questioning comment, not a question; cf. Heaut. 883. Amph. 561, *audes mihi praedicare id, domi te esse nunc, qui hic ades?* is similar to *rogas*. Pers. 214, *sed quid tu? confitere, ut te autumo?* is a genuine question, "But what about you? Do you confess . . .?" Also Heaut. 1015 Dz. Eun. 705, *age nunc, bellua, credis huic quod dicat?* is precisely like the cases of *credin*, with the same suggestion of *num* effect. Hec. 803, *adolescens, dic dum quaeso, es tu Myconius?* would be similar to *esne* Men. 1109, but the vs. is imperfect; *tun es*, an early conjecture, is generally adopted. Trin. 318, *exprobras, bene quod fecisti?* would be parallel to *rogas*, but I should read *quid exprobras* with Bx. and MSS. Ps. 488, *fatere? dic*, is similar to Capt. 317, *sed faterin . . .?* but there is no necessity for changing to *faterin*, as proposed by Becker, 132; cf. *confitere* above. Heaut. 765, *vah, gloriare evenisse ex sententia?* is not a question, but like *rogas*. Also Heaut. 982, *inrides in re tanta neque me consilio quicquam adiuvas?* Poen. 1103, *intellegis?* at the end of a long explanation, cf. *tenesne, iam tenes, tenes*, is a question, but with some slight impv. effect. Heaut. 537, *eho, quaeso, laudas, qui eros fallunt?* is like *rogas*. Pers. 357, *quid? metuis ne te vendam?* Heaut. 1017, *quid? metuis ne . . .?* are influenced by *quid?* and are exclamatory rather than interrogative. So also Aul. 720, *nescis?* (though this may be a repetition), And. 791, *eho inepta, nescis quid sit actum?* and Andr. 348, *obtundis, tam etsi intellego?* (Speng. uses period). Ps. 85, *sed potes nunc mutuam drachumam mihi unam dare, . . .?* is precisely parallel to *potin* with the infin. Pers. 733, *redis tu tandem?* is like *advenis modo?* above. Pers. 379, *scis nam tibi quae praecepi?* Eun. 952, 1035, 1036 (twice), Heaut. 529 and Ad. 215 are all parallel to corresponding forms with *scin*. In Heaut. 529,

scis esse factum ut dico? the *nonne* effect is produced by *ut dico*. Ps. 216 (Lor. Goetz, period), Heaut. 700, Ph. 214, *tenes?* are like *tenesne*, Heaut. 778. Ps. 1157, *vides, iam die (diem Lor.) multum esse?* is parallel to *viden* with infin. having *nonne* effect. Most. 1105, *aspicedum contra me. || aspexi. || vides? || video* is not quite clear without the stage "business," but is apparently exclamatory. Andr. 898, *impera. vis me uxorem ducere? hanc vis mittere? ut potero, feram*; the corresponding forms with *vin* imply an offer of service, these are more nearly neutral, and so have the effect of a protasis with *feram* for apodosis.

Pl. 12 [13], Ter. 19 [20].

Indic. pres. 3d pers. Ad. 924, *iubet frater?* These are the first words of a scene and are probably meant as a repetition of words supposed to have been spoken off the stage. Ph. 352, *negat Phanium esse hanc sibi cognatam Demipho? hanc Demipho negat esse cognatam?* These are both exclamatory and similar to repetitions. Men. 923, *dic mihi hoc: solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri?* and Poen. 755, *valent apud te quos volo?* are unemotional questions for information, as are two cases of *licet*, Curc. 621 and Mil. 1329, and one of *placet*, Ad. 736. Rud. 803, *licet saltem istas mi appellare?* I should punctuate with period because of *saltem*.

In Amph. 995, *amat? sapit*, Eun. 252, *negat quis? nego: ait? aio*, the questions stand for protases and may be punctuated *amat: sapit*. The usage is well known.

Instances of *est (sunt)* are Aul. 357, Men. 1107 (twice), Merc. 563, Poen. 165, 253 (*adsunt*), Ad. 556, 778, And. 789. In St. 186, *promitte vero: ne gravare: est commodum?* (so Rit. Goetz) I should prefer a period. All these are regular questions, absolutely the same as similar forms with *estne*; cf. e. g. Heaut. 454, *estne ea intus?* with And. 789, *est Simo intus?*

Pl. 11 [13], Ter. 8.

Indic. impf. Ad. 693, *quid? credebas dormienti haec tibi confecturos deos?* Ph. 902, *verebamini ne id non facerem quod recepissem semel?* (Dz. *an rebamini*, v. Krit. Anh.) Both are exclamatory.

Ter. 2.

Indic. fut. Truc. 206, *ibo igitur intro? || quippini?* is parallel to Mil. 1242, *adibon*; both are unusual because of the tense. Hec. 672, *quid dixti? eho, an non alemus, Pamphile? prodemus, quaeso, potius?* is exclamatory, as if repeated from a previous

speech. Curc. 73, Ad. 192 are exclamatory and properly future. On *obtundes* ? or *obtundis* ? Ph. 515, see under IV C.

Pl. 2, Ter. 2 [3].

Indic. perf. In the 1st person only Cas. V 4, 18, beside those already given under IV B. In the 2d pers. the only clear cases are Mil. 829, *prompsisti tu vinum* ? Poen. 723, *vidistis leno quom aurum accepit* ? and Rud. 378, *cavistis ergo tu atque erus ne abiret, . . .* ? In other cases the MSS vary. Most. 594, Epid. 539, 554, Cist. III 15 are entirely uncertain. In Aul. 171, And. 975, Eun. 692, Heaut. 684, 731 the metrical probabilities favor the forms without *ne* ; in Mil. 556 A has *vidisti*, and so Bx. Lor. In spite of the uncertainty (see above I, A, *ne* with the perf. indic.), it is clear that the forms without *ne* are regular questions ; indeed, the uncertainty itself shows that there is no difference in sense between the questions with *ne* and those without *ne*. In the 3d pers. Heaut. 978, *abiit* ? is exclamatory, recognizing a fact, not asking a question. Hec. 527, *peperit filia* ? *hem, taces* ? is usually printed with colon ; I can see no reason why a question mark should not be used. Some other cases have been given under IV B.

Pl. 6, Ter. 6.

Plupf. Eun. 429 is exclamatory.

Periphrastic forms are Ad. 796, *dictum hoc inter nos fuit . . .* ? *responde*, And. 665, *factum hoc est, Dave* ? || *factum* ; these are regular questions, though the first has *nonne* effect. And. 751, *dictura es quod rogo* ? has impv. force, but see above I, A, *ne* with fut. ptc. Rud. 982, *quid ais, . . .* ? *ausu's etiam comparare vidulum cum piscibus* ? (Seyffert, Sch., *ausis*). Pl. 1, Ter. 3.

Subjunctive pres. Men. 539, *dicam curare* ? Bacch. 65 ff., *adulescens homo penetrem me huiusmodi in palaestram, . . .* ? Ad. 625, *nunc quid faciam* ? *dicam fratris esse hanc* ? And. 640, Eun. 49, Ph. 186, *quid remedium inveniam . . .* ? *loquarne* ? *incendam* : *taceam* ? *instigem* : *purgem me* ? *laterem lavem*. This last has the force of a condition. In the 2d pers. Asin. 878, *possis, si forte . . . videas, cognoscere* ? cf. Merc. 518, *possin*, with the same sense. Asin. 814, 815. Impf. Ad. 395 ; Wag. Fleck. Dz. insert *num*. All these have precise parallels with *ne*.

Pl. 5, Ter. 5 [6].

Summing these up it appears, in the first place, that about one-third, including most of the sentences which consist of the verb alone, are not properly interrogative, but exclamatory, and closely related to repetitions and to *rogas* ? and *negas* ? So *advenis*

modo ? means "Just come, have you?" not "Have you just come?" *abiit* ? means "He's gone?" cf. *satin abiit* ? and *quid ? metuis . . .* ? is "What! you're afraid that . . .?" The large preponderance of cases from Ter. is partly due to the fact that he uses exclamations (cf. *rogas*, *rogilas*) more frequently than Pl. These exclamations have few parallels among questions with *ne* appended to the verb.

In the second place, of the cases which have parallels in questions with *ne*, nearly all are unemotional questions, asked for information. These comprise about half of the whole number, and the correspondence between them and forms with *ne* is so close as to make it plain that *ne* is not at all necessary to an unemotional question. Pl. could say *est* or *estne* without difference of meaning. Nor is *ne* essential in all idiomatic and emotional forms of question; the effect of *num* is given without it (*credis* = *credin*), and the effect of *nonne* in about half a dozen cases. Of impv. questions, however, there are no clear cases, and there are comparatively few idioms, like those with *ain*, *audin*, *scin*, *viden*; the few cases that do occur are of the simplest sort. While, therefore, *ne* is not essential to the genuine question nor even to some kinds of idiom, it appears that the widest development of idiomatic questions is to be found only in connection with *ne*. But because of the small number of questions without *ne* this conclusion should not be pushed too far.

H. SENTENCES HAVING THE VERB NEAR THE END.

Under this head are placed also the few cases in which the verb is neither at the beginning nor at the end, for which it has not seemed necessary to make separate classes.

So far as these sentences correspond to questions with *ne*, given in the various sub-classes I. B-K, the parallels will be pointed out. Of the sentences which have no parallels with *ne*, which are too numerous to be given in full, sufficient illustrations will be given.

Indic. pres. 1st pers. And. 906, *Andrium ego Critonem video ? certe is est*, corresponds in sense to *videon* in soliloquy. Heaut. 579, *Clitipho, haec ego praecipio tibi ?* is parallel to *haecine*, e. g. Most. 25 f., with rejecting effect. There is no case parallel to Ph. 812, *hanc igitur mittimus ?* And. 921, *ego istaec moveo aut curo ?* Eun. 179 (and Hec. 875 without verb) are exactly like Ph. 999, *egon timeo ?* i. e. they repeat and reject an idea already suggested. Merc. 172, *tandem indignus videor ?* if the text is correct, is

exclamatory, as is Andr. 500, *inrideor?* which only Speng. prints as question. Amph. 391, Cas. V 4, 28, *tuae fidei credo?* || *meae*, are hesitating declarative sentences, "I trust to your honor?" not as Uss. says, equivalent to *credamne*, and entirely different from Andr. 497.

Pl. 3, Ter. 6.

Pres. indic., 2d pers. Ad. 596, *id quia non est a me factum, agis gratias?* has some questioning effect, due perhaps to the fact that the verb stands first in the main clause. Ph. 985, *rape hunc.* || *sic agitis?* is exclamatory and rejecting, but has many parallels with *ne*, e. g. Ad. 128, Eun. 99, *sicine agis?* Men. 1108, *patrem fuisse Moschum tibi ais?* and Andr. 908 do not differ greatly from *ain* with infin. Men. 741 (*attines*) is exclamatory. Asin. 485 (see above under *ain*), Men. 514, 924, Rud. 1099, Trin. 695, Hec. 675, Andr. 545, all with *censes*, are like *censen* in having a rejecting force which comes partly from the sense of *censeo*, but differ from *censen* in being less distinctly interrogative; cf. also Andr. 505. Eun. 897 (*cogitas*) is like *censes*. Capt. 556, Trin. 649, Ad. 748, Eun. 245, Heaut. 729, all with *credis*, have an infin. and exclamatory effect, except Capt. 556, which corresponds pretty closely to Eun. 812, *credin?* with interrogative force. Ps. 1315, *at negabas daturum esse te mihi: tamen das?* is really declarative, with slight interrogative inflection. All cases of *dan* have impv. effect. Hec. 524, . . . *mi vir* || *vir ego tuos sim?* *tu virum me aut hominem deputas adeo esse?* is exclamatory and has parallels with *tun*. Men. 1139, *hanc tu dicis, frater, pallam, . . .?* (Fleck. Rit. *hancine*, which would be equally correct in sense), Merc. 912, Trin. 466, Heaut. 596, 888, all with *dicis*, are declarative with slight questioning or exclamatory inflection; *dicisne*, used only twice, is impv. Ad. 104, *tu nunc tibi id laudi ducis, quod tum fecisti inopia?* is exclamatory, like *rogas*. Andr. 321, *hodie uxorem ducis?* || *aiunt*, is almost declarative, with faint questioning inflection. With *es*, Men. 1078, *quae haec fabulast?* *tu's Menaechmus?* is an exclamatory repetition; Trin. 987, *ipsus es?* and Poen. 866, *malus es?* are questioning; Rud. 1305 is so nearly declarative that it might equally well be printed with a period; Trin. 635, *tu mihi es melior quam egomet mihi?* (Rit.³ *tun*) has been given under *tun*, but in either case it would be exclamatory. I should read *tu* with Bx., but without accepting his reason (Krit. Anh.), "da die energische Frage ohne *ne* für den Ausdruck des Unwillens viel angemessener ist." Ad. 167, *ceterum hoc nili facis?* is exclamatory. Umpf. uses a period.

Ad. 769, *ohē iam : tu verba fundis hic sapientia ?* is exclamatory. Heaut. 718, *tantum sat habes ?* is exclamatory, not questioning like *satin habes, si*. Asin. 579, *hoc quod rogo responde. || rogita quod vis. || argenti viginti minas habes nunc ?* (so Müll., Goetz. MSS *habesne*). The position of *habesne* is without a parallel in Pl., but Müller's reading is not at all satisfying; *habes nunc* would be almost a declarative sentence, while the context calls for a formal and unemotional question, like those with *haben*. Pers. 850, *inrides*, and Ad. 135, *irascere*, are like *rogas*. Heaut. 315, *hoc vide : in mea vita tu tibi is quaesitum, scelus ?* is exclamatory; *in (isne)* has impv. force. Asin. 593, *salve. || salvere me iubes, quoi tu abiens adfers morbum ?* usually printed with period, is like *rogas*, as is Eun. 1053, *laudas*. Merc. 160, *dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites ?* is half-declarative. Ps. 442, *mirare*, And. 764, *nescis*, Most. 16, *obiectas*, Rud. 876, *opsecras* (Vulg. Sch. with period), Asin. 189, Cist. Frag. IX, Ben., *postulas*, Truc. 413, *procuras* (Sch. prints as exclamation) are all either exclamatory or declarative. Merc. 654, *cedo . . . amorem te hic relicturum putas ?* has considerable questioning force, due probably to *cedo*. Heaut. 741, *dignam me putas . . . ?* Amph. 284, are like *censes*. Eun. 426, *lepus tute es : pulpamentum quaeris ?* might as well be declarative; cf. Wagner's note. Amph. 816, *quaeris*, is exactly like *rogas*. Asin. 398, *tu id nunc refers ?* is like cases with *tun*, expressing rejection. Hec. 706, Ph. 684, *respondes*, are like *taces, rogas*. Aul. 214, Poen. 724, Heaut. 181, *scis (scitis)*, differ from *scin* in that they take the knowledge for granted and are only slightly interrogative. In Merc. 719, *sic tu me temptas sciens ?* there is less emphasis upon *sic* than in questions with *sicine*, but the rejecting force is the same. Cist. Frag. II Ben., *quid ? tuam times amicam . . . ?* and Heaut. 910, *quid ? istuc times . . . ?* are exclamatory. Ad. 233, *nunc demum venis ?* is partially declarative. Ph. 60, *verere*, is like *metuis, times* and other verbs of emotion. With *vis* the case is less clear. Men. 1155, *ergo nunc iam vis conclamari auctionem fore ?* Rud. 1074, And. 708 all have questioning force, and in all *vis* precedes the dependent verb, infin. or subjunct. So also in Hec. 787, where A has . . . *ob eam rem. || vin ergo intro eam ?* the other MSS || *ob eam rem vis ergo intro eam ?* which latter I believe to be correct. Heaut. 87, *scire hoc vis ?* takes up *fac me ut sciam* of 84, and has very little questioning force. Pers. 681, *quod te dignumst, me dignum esse vis ?* is exclamatory and rejecting. Most. 262, *scita's tu qui-*

dem. nova pictura interpolare vis opus lepidissimum? is so clearly declarative that it might better have a period. Mil. 68 (I 1, 38) and Ps. 47 have been given above. Men. 848, *votas*, is like *rogas*, and Ritschl's conj. *men* is unnecessary. Ps. 826, *utere*, is repudiating, with some slight questioning force from *quid tu?*

In 2d pers. Pl. 40, Ter. 32.

In the cases which follow it is not necessary to do more than indicate the general group, questioning, exclamatory or declarative, to which the sentence seems most nearly allied, and even this general grouping cannot be precise, since these three tendencies may all appear in a single sentence.

In the 3d pers. pres. indic. Ad. 246, *omnes dentes labefecit, . . . : etiam insuper defraudat?* is the nearest representative of the interrogation. Five with *videtur*, Ba. 854, Ps. 472, Rud. 983, 1230, Ph. 1033, and Ad. 736, *placet*, are exclamatory and rejecting. Curc. 572, Aul. 720, Hec. 500 (Wag. with period), and Merc. 714 are declarative with slight questioning or exclamatory force. In Merc. 714 a period would express the sense equally well. Merc. 948, Truc. 585, Cas. 353 Gepp. are entirely uncertain. Eun. 733 is given under *multon*, Ps. 1002, And. 949 under *non*.

Cases with *est* are more frequent, and about half have an introductory phrase or semi-parenthetic verb like *quaeso*, *opseco*. Interrogative are Amph. 774, *salvom signumst?* || *inspice*. || *recte*, Ba. 718, *nulla*, Epid. 643, Rud. 284, 1054. The exclamatory sentences are mainly repetitions, Ad. 950, . . . *paulum* . . . || *paulum id autemst?* Merc. 534, 974, Most. 628, Pers. 491, Rud. 740, 1399, And. 875; these are repetitions with *est* added. Ad. 707 is like *hocine*; Hec. 527 like *istucine*; Bacch. 616, Rud. 960, Heaut. 607 have slight interrogative force, and so resemble adjectives with *ne*. Ps. 294 (2), Rud. 1113, Ad. 388, Heaut. 583 are rejecting exclamations. Most. 444, *sed quid hoc? occlusa ianuast interdus?* is usually printed with period, but is like other partially declarative sentences. So also Eun. 1040.

Pl. 24, Ter. 12.

Indic impf. Eun. 155, *aut ego nescibam quorsum tu ires?* (So Umpf. *at*, with period, Bent. Wag. Dz.) This is an ironical declarative sentence, and approaches a question, though not closely enough to warrant the interrogative sign. Men. 1122, *dic mihi: uno nomine ambo eratis?* is clearly interrogative. Men. 625, Pers. 686, Ad. 901, Ph. 858 are exclamatory. Heaut. 907, *hem, Clinia haec fieri videbat?* is a hesitating assertion. Pl. 3, Ter. 3 [4].

Indic. fut. Mil. 1021, *quid ego? hic astabo . . .?* Rud. 658, Curc. 204 are rejecting exclamations. Rud. 1270 has more questioning force. In 2d pers. Capt. 892, Merc. 649, Eun. 690, Hec. 232 are strongly repudiating. Aul. 773, 774 are in a series of questions which demand a promise rather than ask for a reply. They are imperative futures with slight interrogative inflection. In Eun. 536 the MSS favor *malam rem hinc ibis?* with impv. effect; this is without parallel, but Ter. shows considerable variety in impv. questions. In the 3d pers. Poen. 729, *quid si . . . pullem?* || *censeo.* || *si pullem, non recludet?* is equivalent to *quid si pullem atque ille non recludet?* Merc. 458, 459, Eun. 638 are exclamatory. In Cas. III 5, 38 *ne* is called for by the metre. Men. 792, . . . *ibi potat.* || *tua quidem ille causa potabit minus, . . .?* is exactly like Capt. 845, Pers. 747, and Rit. has *tuan* here also; but *ne* is not at all necessary to the sense.

Pl. 12, Ter. 4.

Indic. perf. Men. 394 is exclamatory and is in sense a repetition; Cas. V 4, 16, *ego istuc feci?* is an exclamation with precisely the same sense as *egon*. Asin. 410, *hodie salvere iussi Libanum libertum? iam manu emissust?* is an ironical assertion with slight interrogative force. Eun. 420, *quid illud, Gnatho, quo pacto Rhodium tetigerim in convivio, numquam tibi dixi?* involves an anacoluthon, and the strong interrogative force is due to that fact.

Indic. perf. 2d pers. Interrogative effect is somewhat distinct in Epid. 596 (with *quid*), Mil. 1219 (with *opsecre*), Poen. 759, Heaut. 884 (both with *dic mihi*), Heaut. 830. On Andr. 742 see *tun*; for Ph. 577 see perf. with *ne*. The following are repudiating exclamations: Amph. 725 (cf. 717), Asin. 926, Capt. 717, Pers. 798, Rud. 993, Trin. 138, Eun. 241, Heaut. 685, Ph. 467. The declarative force is prominent in Asin. 252 f. (only Uss. prints as question), Asin. 416, Most. 1010 (both of these might as well have a period, since the interrogative effect is barely perceptible), Poen. 591, And. 586. Cist. II 3, 39 is entirely confused.

In the 3d pers. Asin. 432, *eho, Coriscus pro vectura olivi rem soluit?* || *solvit*, 441, *Dromo mercedem rettulit?* are interrogative, but they have an intentionally peremptory tone, as from a superior to an inferior; cf. 444, where *rettulitne* is at the end of the sentence.¹ Bacch. 502 is equivalent to a condition. Mil. 1043, And.

¹ Other cases where the omission of *ne* appears to be associated with an urgent and peremptory tone are And. 665, *factum hoc est, Dave?* 751, *dic-*

241 are exclamations. Most. 977, 978, Pers. 131 are assertions which get a slight interrogative tone from the context.

Pl. 23, Ter. 8.

Indic. plupf. only in Ad. 465, *noras*, with declarative force.

Ter. 1.

Indic. fut. pf. Truc. 547, where Speng. uses period. Pl. 1.

Compound forms are all in the perfect. Rud. 187 is exclamatory, but the text is somewhat uncertain. St. 372, *hem, quid? Epignomum elocutus?* is like *ais*, referring to what has just been said. Heaut. 522, *faceta haec meretrix. || sane. || idem visast tibi?* "You think so too?" has as much questioning force as any; the rest are clearly exclamatory or declarative, Cist. II 1, 16, Epid. 650 (*quid?*), Heaut. 580, Merc. 976, Asin. 330, Men. 611, Capt. 568, Ps. 631; in the last four I should use a period.

Pl. 9, Ter. 2.

With the subjunctive a dependent infin. is rarely used, and the sentences are for the most part so short that the position of the verb cannot be expected to have much influence upon the meaning.

Subj. pres., 1st pers. Bacch. 903, *hodie exigam aurum hoc? || exige*, and Trin. 59, *vin conmutemus? tuam ego ducam et tu meam?* are the only cases which have any questioning force. The rest are all exclamatory and rejecting, like *egone* with the pres. subj. They are Asin. 506 (Goetz *ubi*), Aul. 45, Capt. 139 (Sch. *egone*), Pers. 26, Poen. 352, 730, Ps. 318, St. 297, And. 231, Eun. 798, Heaut. 131, 413, Hec. 434, Ph. 419, 1022.

With the 2d pers. all cases are exclamatory and correspond to *tun* with subjunct. They are Asin. 489, 812 (?), Merc. 575, And. 619, Eun. 460, Hec. 589.

With the 3d pers., all exclamatory, Curc. 193, Truc. 754, Heaut. 128 ff., Ph. 813. Also Hec. 878, Dz.; Um. *an*.

In the impf. all are exclamatory, and repeat with more or less of distinctness a suggestion already expressed: Most. 183, Rud. 842 (Sch. *quid ego*, etc., without any mark after *quid*), Truc. 625. Truc. 501 is utterly confused; Aul. 286 should have a period; Trin. 957, where the MSS have *mihi*, Rit. Bx. *mihin concrederet*, has been placed under *mihin*, I. B, because there is no precise

tura es quod rogo? Mil. 829, *prompsisti tu illi vinum?* 833, *neque tu bibisti?* I have noted no cases exactly like those in the Asin., and this suggestion may be fanciful, but an assertive form of question might easily be rudely and harshly employed.

parallel without *ne*, yet I greatly doubt whether *ne* is at all necessary. A few of these cases have been given above, IV B and D.

Pl. 17, Ter. 13.

As has been remarked, these sentences exhibit three tendencies. They are (*a*) declarative sentences with slight interrogative inflection, (*b*) exclamations, mostly with repudiating effect, or (*c*) questions like those in the preceding class. These are not different kinds of questions, but merely different uses to which this one kind of sentence may be put. Of the declarative sentences there are about 40 cases. They are nothing more than ordinary declarations, made with some hesitation, which was no doubt expressed by the voice, but was not sufficiently strong or not sufficiently concentrated upon any single word to bring about a change from the normal position of the verb in a declarative sentence. In fact, as in sentences with *scilicet*, *fortasse* or a parenthetic *credo* (see IV A), the hesitation was not about any single word, but about the correctness of the statement as a whole. The exclamations, which include about 140 of the 200 cases, are like the other kinds of exclamatory sentence already given and express doubt or wonder or absolute incredulity by repeating with exclamatory inflection the statement which has excited the emotion. In most cases they repudiate the statement. Even in the third use, in the 20 or 25 cases which most nearly approach a real interrogation, something of declarative or exclamatory effect generally appears, indicating that these are essentially like the other uses, and differ from them less widely than they do from sentences in which the inflection has been strong enough to bring the verb to the first place in the sentence. In most cases, also, the interrogation is partly expressed by *quaeso*, *dic*, *opsecro* and similar words, making the question semi-indirect.

In general, therefore, there is in questions which have the verb at or near the end a correspondence between form and function; they are declarative sentences with exclamatory inflection, or with a questioning inflection too slight to bring about a departure from the declarative order.

V.—QUESTIONS WITH *ut* AND WITH THE INFINITIVE.

Questions with *ut* interrogative and the indic. are merely a variety of the *quis*-question, and of these I have made no lists. Apparently, in passing over these, I have omitted also cases of *ut* with the subjunct., which should have been noted for the sake

of comparison with *egon ut* sentences, and I fear that the following list is imperfect. Amph. 694, *quid enim censes? te ut deludam contra, . . .?* Trin. 750, *ut ego nunc adulescenti thesaurum indicem . . .?* Cist. IV 1, 10, And. 618, *oh, tibi ego ut credam, furcifer?* Heaut. 1050, *mea bona ut dem Bacchidi dono sciens?* In 2d pers. pres., Poen. 316, perf. Men. 683, 3d pers. pres. Ad. 238, Ph. 669, perf. Most. 14 (L²), 1017, Ad. 530, Heaut. 954, Hec. 138 f. Most. 1172 is purely conjectural. Ad. 655 repeats 654.

Questions or exclamations with the infin. have been partly given under *hicine, itane* and other words, but are repeated here in order to bring all infin. questions together.

With *adeon* followed by an *ut*-clause, Bacch. 283, *adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem . . .?* And. 245, Eun. 225, Heaut. 980, Hec. 532, Ph. 153, 497, 499. In And. 879 all MSS have *adeon* against the metre, generally corrected to *adeo*; it will be seen from cases below that there is nothing remarkable in the omission of *ne*.

With *itane*, Ph. 810, *itan parvam mihi fidem esse apud te?* Ph. 466. With *ita*, Heaut. 503.

With *sicine*, Curc. 589, Pers. 42, And. 689; with *sic*, Ph. 528 U.

With some form of *hicine*, Asin. 226, *haecine te esse oblitum . . .?* Curc. 694 (for Curc. 200 see I. H. e), Mil. 626, Ps. 202, Truc. 537, 933, Ad. 237, 390, 408, 611, Eun. 644, Heaut. 401. The only cases without *ne* which at all correspond to these are Ph. 503, . . . *tum hoc esse mihi obiectum malum?* and Hec. 613, *hinc abire matrem?* *minime*. (There is no case of *hincine*.)

Other pronominal forms are *istacine* Aul. 746, *illan* (abl.) Ad. 448, *quemquamne* Ad. 38, Heaut. 912, *neminemne* Eun. 553, *nosne* Hec. 645, *ten* Ph. 339 (cf. Ps. 371), *meamne* Mil. 488, *nullane* And. 425, *tantamne* And. 253, *tantane* Ph. 977. Also *numquamne* (adv.) Eun. 360. Without *ne*, Capt. 783, *ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi hodie?* Also with *tantum*, *tantam*, And. 870, Heaut. 630, Ph. 884; in Heaut. 92, *hui, tam gravis hos, quaeso?* the infin. is to be supplied.

With *nilne*, And. 716; with *nil*, Ph. 1042.

With *non* (*nonne* does not occur with the infin.), Trin. 1046, *non hoc publice animadvorti?* Cas. I 1, 1, Hec. 227, Ph. 231, 232, 978, Ad. 562, 629, Dz.

With *magistron* Bacch. 151, *servon* And. 609.

The other cases without *ne* are Asin. 127, which may be a

continuation of the preceding question, Aul. 338, *tibi recte facere?* Curc. 623, *servom antestari?* Eun. 391, *magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?* This appears to be a repetition of a preceding infin. which Gnatho had used just before the speakers came upon the stage. Heaut. 94 is a repetition in infin.

With *ne*, Pl. 12, Ter. 28.

Without *ne*, Pl. 6, Ter. 18.

The use of the infin. in exclamations calls for no comment, but it may be noted that the greater number of these exclamations are associated with special words, *adeo, ita, sic, hic* and other demonstratives and the negative. This points to a close relationship to the forms given under I. B. Also, while *ne* is more often used than omitted, there is no form of question, except that with *non*, which has not a moderately close parallel without *ne*.

VI.—*An* AND DISJUNCTIVE QUESTIONS.¹

The received doctrine concerning *an* is thus summarized by Schmalz, Syntax, p. 299: "Unstreitig die wichtigste Fragepartikel ist *an*; im vollständig ausgesprochenen disjunktiven Frage-satze leitet es, wie wir gesehen, den zweiten Teil der Frage ein. Aber wie wir nicht in vollständigen Syllogismen sprechen, sondern eine oder die andere Prämisse unterdrücken, so genügt oft auch—wie oben bei *utrum* bemerkt—ein Teil der disjunktiven Frage, in der Regel der zweite. Und so steht *an* scheinbar in einer einfachen Frage. Dieser Gebrauch findet sich schon bei den Komikern, hat aber seine höchste Ausbildung in der Sprache Ciceros erreicht."

For reasons which will be given later, and especially because a prejudgment of the case may be thus avoided, I shall give first the simple questions with *an*, those which are commonly regarded as the second part of an incomplete disjunctive question, and afterward the complete questions with *utrum—an*. The connection between *an* and *av*, and the derivation of both from a pronomi-

¹ It was not until after the following pages were in the hands of the Editor of this Journal that I obtained the dissertation of P. Hinze, de *an* partic. ap. prisc. script. Lat. vi et usu, Halle, 1887, also as program, Brandenburg, 1887. Hinze classifies the examples according to the presence or absence of *eho, autem*, etc., and includes the indirect questions, thereby adding considerably to the weight of the argument. But in the main his classification and results anticipate what is given here. I have left my own work as it was written, with the addition of a note or two, partly for the sake of completeness, partly in the hope of reaching a different circle of readers.

nal stem *an*, "that" or "the other, the second," seems to be generally accepted, and, in accordance with this etymology and with the actual usage in Latin, the relation between the *an*-question and the preceding sentence is made the basis of the classification.

(a). The question with *an* is at the beginning of a speech and refers back to what has been said by the previous speaker.

In these cases the leading verb of the preceding sentence is never repeated without change in the *an*-question. (For Bacch. 1162 see below.) If the idea of the leading verb is repeated, it is always with some change of phrase, and this change seems to be intentional and to be essential in a question with *an*. Generally, however, the idea which is taken up and questioned is a subordinate one in the preceding sentence.

The idea of the main verb is repeated with change of phrase in Mil. 822, *sorbet dormiens* . . . || *quid 'sorbet' ?* || *illud stertit volui dicere* . . . || *eho, an dormit Sceledrus intus ?* Most. 454, *paene confregi* . . . *foris*. || *eho, an tu tetigisti has aedis ?*

In most cases some secondary idea is questioned. Asin. 837, *credam* . . ., *si te hilarum videro*. || *an tu me tristem putas ?* Mil. 419, . . . *si quidem east*. || *an dubium id tibi est eam esse hanc ?* Ps. 309, *te vivom vellem*. || *eho, an iam mortuost ?*

The other cases, differing in no essential particular from these, are Amph. 745, 773, 964, Bacch. 120, 143, 200, Epid. 506, Merc. 393, Mil. 840, Most. 1083, Pers. 855, Poen. 334, 991, 1067, 1136, 1227, Ps. 314, 851, 853, 872, 1161, 1172, Rud. 578 (1274 given below), St. 34, 246, Trin. 371, 637, 934, 942, 943, Truc. 141, 165, Ad. 128, 389, 672, And. 500, 784 [possibly *ain tu haec omnia ?*], Eun. 382, 604, 679, 733, Heaut. 81, 911, 990, 1057, Ph. 235, 259, 626, 902, 1009.

Also *an quid*, Asin. 717, Merc. 145, Ps. 29, Ad. 468, *an quippiam*, Cas. III 5, 38. In Trin. 1018 ff., because of the long intervening clauses, a question beginning with *an* is renewed with *eosne*.

The following are semi-indirect, i. e. they depend upon or contain *dic*, *opseco*, *quaeso*: Asin. 894, Cist. I 1, 70, II 3, 22, Merc. 145, 538, Most. 519, Poen. 475, Ps. 29, Rud. 351, Trin. 986, Eun. 963.

With *non*, Bacch. 121, *an deus est ullus Suavisaviatio ?* || *an non putasti esse umquam ?* Mil. 301, Poen. 490, Ps. 969, Ad. 136, And. 766, 781, 807, Eun. 959, Hec. 100. In Poen. 490 *non* is separated from *an*, and there is no resemblance in any of the

passages from Pl. to *an non* in the second half of a disjunctive question; in the more numerous Ter. passages the verb is sometimes repeated and the questions are like the common *an non* use.

All the conditions of the use of *an* are satisfied in Most. 178 (MSS omit), Poen. 533 (MSS *at, ad*); in Mil. 217 the text is confused and *an* is unlikely; in Trin. 922 Spengel's emendation (v. Bx.³) is at least as good as anything. In Ps. 472 I should retain *iam* of the MSS, but *an* (Lor.) would give an excellent sense. *An* is especially liable to confusion with *ain*? both in form and in use. The distinction is this, that *ain*? introduces a repetition, generally an exact repetition, while *an* introduces an interpretation with changed phraseology. The two cases in which the reading of the MSS is opposed to this rule are Bacch. 1162, *quid multa? ego amo.* || *an amas?* where I should read *ain? amas?* and Asin. 812, *ain tu?* which Uss., Langen, Beitr. 199, change to *an*. In Aul. 538, *edi sermonem tuom.* || *an audivisti?* Goetz follows Gruter and Bentley in changing to *ain? audivisti?* I should follow the MSS, with hiatus in the change of speakers, because of the change from a more involved to a plainer phrase; cf. esp. Mil. 822 and St. 246, *eho, an audivisti?*

At the beginning of a speech, Pl. 58 [61], Ter. 25.

Looking at these questions by themselves, without reference to the complete disjunctive sentence, the sequence of thought is this: one speaker implies, in the course of what he says, an opinion which excites the surprise or incredulity of the other, who in the *an* sentence questions the correctness of the suggested opinion. This he may do in such a way as to imply that he himself was mistaken, or that the other speaker was mistaken, or he may leave the matter entirely in doubt. In Most. 519, *an quaeso tu appellaveras? ita me di amabunt, mortuom illum credidi expostulare*, Tranio at first pretends to believe that the ghost had called him (*heus, Tranio*, 515), but when Theopropides says *quicum istaec loquere?* he is convinced of his error. So Amph. 964, *me . . . dixisse per iocum.* || *an id ioco dixisti? equidem hercle serio ac vero ratus.* In Poen. 334, . . . *ut Venerem propitiem.* || *eho, an iratast? propitia herclest*, in Trin. 371, 637, and elsewhere, the speaker implies that the idea taken up in the *an*-question was mistaken. But in the great majority of the cases the question with *an* expresses no opinion, but only asks for confirmation and direct assertion of that which has been indirectly implied.

If now we hold to the common doctrine that *an* by its nature always expresses an alternative, it must be acknowledged that in many of these cases it is not difficult to supply a first member like "have I understood you rightly?" "is that the case or . . . ?" Perhaps there is no case in which some form of first member could not be thought out which would at once suit the context and be an antithesis to the *an*-question. But, on the other hand, there is hardly a single one of these questions which naturally and easily suggests a complete disjunctive question; there is in most cases something forced and artificial in the ellipsis, and in some cases, e. g. Ps. 1161, 1172, Mil. 822, 840, Trin. 934, 942, 943, Eun. 733, the awkwardness and artificiality are very clear. The full force of this can be felt only by making an examination of all the cases in the foregoing list. From such an examination, which I have no space to give here in detail, it is clear to me, in the first place, that it would be equally easy to supply a first member for all the questions having *ne* appended to the verb, and, in the second place, that it would be easier to supply a second member to the *an*-questions than to supply a first member, if it were not for the feeling, which comes from the classical Latin, that *an* must necessarily mean "or." In other words, it is logic, not language, which requires the completion of every *an*-question, and the disjunctive question thus formed is simply the logically complete question into which any kind of sentence question may be expanded.

(b). The question with *an*, though not at the beginning of the speech, refers back to the words of the other speaker and the intervening sentence is parenthetic.

The interposed sentence may be a mere remark. Poen. 1194, *sicut nos . . . praestitimus pulcritudine. || stulta . . . es. an tu eo pulcra videre, opsecro, si . . . ?* So Capt. 680, Hec. 878, Trin. 954. Or a question may come between. Hec. 671, . . . *ego alam ? || quid dixti ?* *eho, an non alemus, Parmeno ?* So with *quid ais ?* Hec. 346, with some form of repetition Aul. 82, Ad. 661, Eun. 857, Hec. 209. Ps. 305 belongs in this general class, whether we read *credere autem ?* or with Bugge, Langen, p. 315, *aude*. In Trin. 954 ff. the question with *an* refers either to the preceding speech or to the interposed words, and, in general, the clause is not wholly parenthetic, but is rather a preparation for the *an*-question. This usage therefore forms a kind of connecting link between the preceding class (a) and those which follow.

Pl. 5, Ter. 6.

(c). The question with *an* refers to something which the speaker has himself said. Under this head fall all the remaining questions with *an*, both complete and incomplete, and in order to trace their connection with each other I have subdivided them according to the form of the preceding sentence.

(1). The preceding sentence is declarative. Amph. 1027, *paene ecfregisti . . . cardines. an foris censebas nobis publicitus praeberier?* Amph. 688, Asin. 528, Capt. 257, Men. 962, Most. 334 (the arrangement of speakers is not certain), 596, Poen. 265, St. 294, Truc. 88, And. 621, Hec. 215, Ph. 279 (the intervening speech is an aside), 1024. Pl. 10, Ter. 4.

These occur mostly in the midst of a long speech. They do not express an antithesis or an alternative to what precedes, but rather a possible interpretation of it which suddenly arises in the mind of the speaker and causes him to change his previous opinion, to look upon the matter from a new point of view. So in Men. 962, Menaechmus hardly knows whether he is in his senses or not, and is thinking over the reasons for hoping that he is sane, when suddenly a new explanation of the strange events occurs to him: *an illi, perperam insanire qui aiunt me, ipsi insaniunt?* The awkwardness of supplying a clause with *utrum* is even greater here than in the cases given above, though it is perhaps not possible to exclude the hypothesis of an ellipsis altogether.

(2). A *quis*-question precedes the sentence with *an*. Amph. 661, *quid ille revortitur . . . ? an ille me temptat sciens, . . . ?* Most. 7, *quid tibi . . . clamitatio?* *an ruri censes te esse?* Eun. 907, *quamobrem?* *an quia pudet?* Amph. 457, Asin. 524, Bacch. 676, Capt. 629, Cist. IV 1, 17, Men. 231, 496, 722, Most. 35, Ps. 92, Rud. 111, And. 888, Eun. 1017, Heaut. 334, 543, Hec. 293, 356, 436, 784, Ph. 602. Without verb, Most. 489, St. 549, 552. In Rud. 1274 the speaker pays no attention to the meaningless answer *censeo*. Pl. 17, Ter. 10.

In all these cases the sequence of thought is the same. In the *quis*-question the speaker asks in the most general way about some preceding act; then his mind, reviewing all possible answers, suddenly settles upon one as most probable or most interesting, and he inquires about it in the *an*-sentence. So in Amph. 661 the ideas come up in this way: "He has returned. Why? Which of all possible reasons has caused his return? To try me! Is that it? Is he trying to find out how I bear his absence?" These questions therefore resemble those already given in expressing

the sudden turning of the mind to some new thought. It is possible to supply a first clause, but the sequence of thought indicated above, one of every-day occurrence, is complete enough in itself.

(3). A question with *num* precedes. The only cases are Poen. 1315, Ph. 412, and by conjecture Merc. 981; cf. Madvig, Opusc. Acad. II, p. 230 ff., Kühner, II, p. 1017. As Kühner holds that *num* always expects a negative answer, his remarks do not apply to Poen. 1315. The small number of cases is due to the fact that *num* frequently calls attention to an evident fact about which there could be no further question. Pl. 1 [2], Ter. 1.

(4). A question with *ne* or without a particle precedes the *an*-question. (The illustrations given here will be included in the full list at the end of this division.)

(i). In some cases the preceding question is subordinate and *an* refers back over it, as in the cases under *b*. Ad. 337, . . . *narremus quopiam?* || *au, au, mi homo, sanus es?* *an hoc proferendum tibi videtur usquam?* So Aul. 424, Mil. 499.

(ii). In certain passages the question with *an* is, if reduced to its essential idea, nothing more than a repetition in different form of the preceding question. Asin. 504, *nequeon ego ted interdictis facere mansuetem meis?* *an ita tu's animata ut qui expers matris imperio sis?* These two questions amount to the same thing in the end, but the variation of phrase, the emphasis laid in the one case upon the mother's power, in the other upon the daughter's disposition, introduce a kind of adversative or disjunctive idea; cf. also Poen. 1315, Asin. 509, Eun. 47, 1013, Heaut. 505, Hec. 663, Ad. 782, Ph. 415, the last coming nearest to a complete disjunctive question.

COMPLETE DISJUNCTIVE QUESTIONS.

Although we pass at this point across the line which is commonly held to separate the complete disjunctive question from the so-called incomplete form with *an*, the distinction is so slight that the preceding classification is continued.

(iii). The question with *an* is almost a perfect antithesis to the previous question, but has a different verb.

Mil. 1424, *verberone etiam an iam mittis?* The perfect disjunctive would be *an non verbero?* and the question *an iam mittis?* is not the alternative, but the suggestion of a new third possibility which occurs to the slave as he speaks. As in Most.

7, *quid tibi . . . clamitatioſt ? an ruri censes te eſſe ?* the question with *an* selects one of the possibilities of the *quid*-question, so here *an* selects for expression, not the perfect alternative, but merely a kind of second thought. So Ad. 336, Men. 319, Bacch. 1168, Curc. 589, Merc. 902. In Trin. 468 ff. the antithesis is almost perfect.

(iv). Even where the verb is the same for both clauses the disjunctive idea is sometimes only partially complete. Mil. 783, *ingenuamne an libertinam ?* does not include the possibility of a slave; cf. Mil. 965 and 966.

(v). The use of *an—an* must also be regarded as a survival of the independent *an*-question; cf. Draeg. I 347. Ps. 1247, *pedes, statin an non ? an id voltis, ut me hinc iacentem aliquis tollat ?* shows clearly how, after the complete alternative of the first sentence, a third possibility, explanatory of the *an non*, occurs to the speaker. Other cases are Amph. 690, Epid. 223, Eun. 386, 986, 1044 (*ne—an—an—an*). Cf. Aul. 730.

The illustrations thus far given show how indistinct is the line which separates the independent *an*-question, following another question, from what would properly be punctuated as a single disjunctive question. The next step is the perfect disjunctive with *an non*.

The passages in which *an* follows a question with *ne*, with *an*, or without a particle, whether punctuated as one sentence or as two, are as follows:

ne—an, Amph. 343, Asin. 504, 509, 687, Bacch. 31 (*anne*), Capt. 270, Cas. II 6, 53, Epid. 634, Men. 198, 319, Merc. 130, 150, 602, Mil. 499, 783, 961, 965, 1020, 1424, Ps. 610, Trin. 331, 332, 468 ff., Ad. 185, 336, 337, Eun. 1013, Heaut. 203, Hec. 663, Ph. 275, 415. Pl. 23, Ter. 8.

(—) — *an*, Aul. 424, Bacch. 162, 1168, Capt. 334, Curc. 589, Merc. 902, Men. 915, Rud. 853, Trin. 349, Ad. 782, Eun. 47, Heaut. 505. Pl. 9, Ter. 3.

ne—an non, Aul. 643, 660, Capt. 74, 846, Curc. 566, Epid. 538, Mil. 416, 449, Pers. 533, Ps. 254, 616, 1246, Rud. 1399, Trin. 1071, Truc. 4, 755, 825, And. 186, 201, Heaut. 405, Ph. 852.

Pl. 16, Ter. 4.

These have impv. force in 2d sing. pres. except Aul. 643 and Ps. 616. The rest are mostly *estne*.

(—) — *an non*, Mil. 787, Pers. 378, St. 264, Trin. 983, And. 762, Eun. 546, 968, Heaut. 595, Ph. 147. Pl. 4, Ter. 5.

an — *an*, Amph. 690, Epid. 223, Ps. 1247, Eun. 386, 986, 1044 ff.
Pl. 3, Ter. 3.

The other forms of the complete disjunctive occur as follows:

ne — *necne*, Capt. 713.

utrum — *ne* — *an*, Bacch. 75, Men. 1119, Ps. 709, Rud. 104, St.
118, 703, Ad. 382, Eun. 721. Pl. 5, Ter. 2.

utrum — *an*, Amph. prol. 56 (cf. Mil. 787), Cas. II 4, 10, Cist.
247 Uss. (Frag. 23, Ben.) III 10, Pers. 341, Ps. 878, Rud. 780,
Trin. 175. Pl. 8.

On *anne* see Draeg. I 351, Kühn. II 1016.¹ It is found Bacch.
31, Cist. II 1, 42, Rud. 1140, 1275, Truc. 666, And. 851. Truc. 695
should be *iamne*. These are of course independent uses of *an*.

Pl. 3, Ter. 1.

In the following *an* has been added by conjecture: Cas. III 5,
53, Curc. 129, Poen. 1130, Rud. 233, St. 330, Truc. 135, 723.
Found in the MSS, but omitted for metrical reasons, Pers. 483, Ph.
737. Truc. 272 is somewhat doubtful, but has *an* in an independent
question. In Trin. 922 I have followed Speng. Bx. Ps. 124
is confused in the MSS, but *utrum oculum anne aurem*? (Bx.
Lor.) is probably correct.

This classification of *an* and disjunctive questions is not given
with the belief that it corresponds in detail to the order of develop-
ment, but it is meant to illustrate in a general way the fact that
the independent *an*-sentence preceded the complete disjunctive
question.

1. In language simplicity comes before complexity. The proofs
of this are multiplying in all fields of philology, and it is *a priori*
extremely improbable that the disjunctive question arose at once
in complete form. To reverse the order and derive the simple
question from the compound is to confuse language with logic.

2. While in classical Latin the complete disjunctive question is
more common (so, at least, Draeger appears to state) than *an*
alone, especially in the forms with *utrum*, in Pl. and Ter. the pro-
portion is reversed. In simple sentences *an* is used about 150
times, in compound sentences without *utrum* about 70 times, with
utrum 15 or 16 times. This proportion is explicable only on the
hypothesis that the *utrum* — *an* form was either a new type in

¹ Hinze regards *anne* as the original form. The connection with *ān* and
Gothic *an* is, I think, a fatal objection to this view. I take *an-ne* to be a
further illustration of the extension of *ne* to sentences where it was not strictly
necessary.

the time of Pl. and Ter. or was just dying out. Its later history contradicts the second alternative, since it can hardly be held that the dialogue nature of comedy, favorable as it is to ellipses, can account for a disproportion so great.

3. The difficulty of framing a first member to fill the supposed ellipsis has been already pointed out, and with any one who will make the actual test it will have great weight.

The history of the *an*-sentence I suppose to have been something like this: From its pronominal origin *an* must have derived a strong demonstrative force, whether it meant simply "that" or "the other, the second," and this demonstrative emphasis fitted it for use in questions which began with the sudden perception, either in the speaker's own mind or in the words of another, of some new and interesting suggestion. So *an* selects a single point in the stream of thought—"that! do you mean *that*?"—for emphatic comment or question. Therefore when *an* followed a *quis*-question it contrasted some single possibility with all the others, when it followed a question with *ne* it contrasted some second possibility with the first, and so passed from emphasis to antithesis and to alternation, and finally to the forms in which the verb would be the same in both members and to the perfect disjunctive with *an non*.

To the double question thus formed by mere juxtaposition, as the indirect question was formed out of the direct, and all hypotactic forms out of paratactic, *utrum* was prefixed as a clearer expression of the alternative; cf. the introductory *quid*? As Draeger remarks, I 346, *utrum* retains much of its original pronominal force, e. g. in Men. 1119, *uter eratis, tun an ille, maior*? Bacch. 75, *simulato me amare*. || *utrum ego istuc iocō adsimulem an serio*?

With the growth of logical habits of thought and expression the use of the complete disjunctive question became more general, and it is quite likely that the analogy of the independent *an*-sentence, which was never entirely suppressed, may have led to the use of *an*-questions, especially in rhetorical styles, e. g. in Cicero, with a partially felt ellipsis of a first member; cf. the statistics for Persius and Ovid given by Dr. Morris H. Morgan, *Class. Rev.*, Feb. 1889 (III 1), p. 10. Persius has 5 cases of complete disjunctive question, 2 in which the first member is "easily supplied" and 7 independent; Ovid has 35 complete, 24 with first member "omitted but easily supplied," 21 independent. Dr. Morgan has

kindly sent me the references for these, and the cases in which a first member is supplied from the context seem to me to be of a kind not found in Pl. and Ter. I should say the same of the rhetorical uses so fully studied in Seyffert's *Scholae Latinae*.

IMPERATIVE QUESTIONS.

Questions having something of the force of a command have been noted as they occurred in the foregoing lists. They are *abin*, *accipin*, *audin* when it refers to what is about to be said, *dan datin*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *in (isne)*, *iuben* with *infin.*, *manen*, *praebe*, *properatin*, *recedin*, *reddin* (text not sure), *viden ut* (not distinct), *daturne* (text improbable), *ibin* (text?), *eximesne* (MSS *eximes*), fut. ptc. with *esse* except Eun. 462, *etiamne* (five cases), *potin ut* or *potin* with subjunct., *ecquid agis*, *audis*, etc., *ecquis currit*, *aperit*, etc., *non taces*, *abis*, *respondes*, etc. (27 cases), *etiam taces*, *respondetis*, etc. (19 cases), possibly a few times with *iam*. In sentences without a particle having the verb late there is no impv. force, and there are no clear cases with the verb early (IV G.) ; *an* does not give impv. effect in any case, but in complete disjunctive questions with *an non* some of these forms recur, e. g. *abin an non* ?

These fall into a few general classes, verbs with *ne*, *ecquis ecquid*, *non*, *potin ut*, *etiam(ne)*, and fut. ptcc., and it is at once apparent that these are so various as to exclude the hypothesis that the impv. effect is produced by any single word or single form of question. The only common element is the present tense (omitting the half dozen futures), and it seemed to me possible that the explanation might be found in a vaguely future use of the pres. ; cf. *quid ago ? eon ?* and the 2d pers. fut. for the impv. in assertions. But upon this hypothesis the future itself should be frequently used with impv. force (cf. *quid ago ?* with the much more frequent *quid agam ?*), whereas it occurs only six or eight times. Also the 2d pers. fut. has impv. force because its use expresses a confident expectation, and this would correspond to the use of the 1st pers. in questions ; cf. the uses of *iam*. It is easy to translate *abin* ? "will you get out?" but the Engl. *will* simply confuses the precise sense of the Latin. I conclude, therefore, that the impv. questions cannot belong to the class of idioms which preserve a meaning originally inherent in a word or phrase, but must be explained as later deviations from the original and proper meanings of questions. In other words, they may be strictly called "questions

used instead of commands," and it remains only to discover, if possible, the psychological motives which led to the use of the interrogative sentence in imperative functions.

In the majority of cases, especially with *ne*, the impv. use lies close to the *ne* = *nonne* usage, that is, it results from the employment of a formal question where only one answer is possible. Thus *abin*, addressed as it usually is by a superior to an inferior, is a hint so strong as to amount to a command; *accipin*, in immediate connection with *tene* and *accipe*, is like Engl. "Are you going to take this?" So the other verbs, *audin*, *dan*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *praebe*n and the rest, all refer to some act which was plainly not being performed, and about which the speaker could not ask for information: "Are you running away? are you giving me water?" The circumstances supplied the answer, so that there could not be any real interrogation; only the urgency remained and gave a partial impv. effect.

In a few cases certainly, perhaps in most, there is also an ironical tone, produced or expressed by asking a very formal question where the answer is obvious. So with *potin ut*, which almost always has a verb of passivity depending upon it, *quiescas*, *molestus ne sis*, etc., like the Engl. "Will you be so kind as to attend to your own business?"

With *non taces?* *non abis?* *etiam tu taces?* about 50 cases in all, there is no formal questioning; the sentences are exclamatory, and the impv. effect, which is not very strong, is only a slight extension of the exclamation. *non taces?* means "You don't keep still! (I am surprised; I had supposed you would)." *etiam tu taces?* means "Quiet at last! (I expected you to keep still long ago)."

While these questions may properly be said to be used "instead of the impv." and may in some cases seem to be really equivalent to it, they nevertheless retain a close connection with their original use. Thus *abin an non?* || *abeo*; thus *dicisne* is answered once by *dicam*, once by *dico*, *fugin* by *ego vero ac lubens*, *viden* by *video*, *potin ut* by *potest*, *non taces* by *non taceo*. These show conclusively that a sense of the interrogation was still left, as indeed must have been the case as long as *audin*, *viden* and others could still be used in a pure interrogation. On *ecquis hic est?* and *ecquis aperit?* used side by side (an especially instructive case) see III, near the end. On the other hand, of the verbs given above with *ne* having impv. force, *abin*, *accipin*, *dan*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *in*,

manen, mittin, praebeben, properatin, recedin, reddin are never used without impv. force, in a pure interrogation. This is doubtless due partly to the meaning of the verbs, but it seems to me to indicate that, as they took on the impv. function, they tended to lose the interrogative function and to become fixed in the impv. sense. This is most distinct in *abin*, which became formulaic in curses.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE.

The early history of the Latin interrogative sentence must of necessity rest largely upon inference, and the following sketch is not supposed to be a final statement, but is intended as a working hypothesis to be filled out at some future time.

It is a mistake to measure the interrogative sentence by the standard of the declarative. The earliest sentence was neither declarative, nor imperative, nor exclamatory, nor interrogative, but contained in itself the possibilities of all these, and could be all of them by turns. It had no normal order and no normal voice-inflection, but the earliest step toward differentiation must have been the association of certain successions of words and certain inflections with special meanings. So a sentence with the verb at the end and with unemotional inflection became associated with the simple declaration, and in the same way arose several forms of sentence varying in meaning from the exclamation to the comparatively unemotional question: *First*, a sentence like the declarative, but with emotional, perhaps rising, inflection, in which the voice expressed sufficiently the very slight interrogative-exclamatory character. *Second*, sentences in which some form of the pronoun stood first. These were considerably varied and included or were the source of many later forms of the interrogative sentence. Perhaps the most distinct were those in which the pronoun was the subject and had not begun to change at all into an adverb or particle. So *hic, ille, iste* and the personal pronouns *ego, tu*, which not only stood at the beginning, but by the very fact that they were expressed at all aided the exclamatory-interrogative character of the sentence. With these was used a sentence in which the indefinite (originally demonstrative) *quis* stood at the beginning.¹ Further, there were sentences in which words of pronominal stem

¹ It is of course possible to suppose that the interrogative function was developed in this word before the indefinite, but see Kvičala, *Unters. auf dem Gebiete der Pron.*, p. 6 ff.; Paul, *Princ.*² p. 109.

in the acc. or loc., perhaps already turned into adverbs, stood at the beginning. Among these (for some may have been lost) were *an*, a word of such strong demonstrative force that it had a contrasting effect, and *num* or *nunc*, of the same stem as *nam*. Third, the verb itself took the first place in the sentence under the influence of strongly marked interrogative inflection; this strong emphasis upon the most important word of the sentence doubtless marked the widest departure from the declarative and the nearest approach to the simple question.

Some of these forms, perhaps all, must have been very early. The last, with the verb at the beginning, appears in German, and, I am told, in Gothic also, but I have been unable to find out whether the Sanskrit has any such interrogative form, and must in any case leave to comparative philologists the question whether this was an original I. E. form of sentence. I should conjecture that it was.

At this stage there was no special form of question for the *nonne* sense, but as this sense is really very close to the neutral question it was expressed by the question with the verb early, e. g. *sum verus?* Cf. also the uses of *ecquid* above. Even for questions expecting a negative answer, though *num* was used early, the differentiation was so incomplete that this sense could be expressed by sentences which had the verb at the beginning (*credis*) or by *ecquid*.

From this second stage in the development of the interrogative sentence arose three particles, that is, of the words upon which the interrogative emphasis rested, three lost in large measure their proper meaning, and, by constant association with questions, seemed to be and therefore became mere signs of the interrogation, though retaining traces of their original use. Of these the most important was *an*, which, if not the earliest, was certainly very early, and was entirely independent in its development, that is, was not made interrogative by association with any other word, but by the fact of its having stood as a strong demonstrative at the head of the sentence. I cannot see that it makes any difference whether we say that the stem meant "that" or "the other, the second," since the latter meaning is nothing but a development of the strong contrasting demonstrative idea. The use of *an* in corrective and adversative questions and its later disjunctive force have already been discussed in detail.

The second particle which must be referred to this early stage

is *num*. While acknowledging freely the obscurity which surrounds the origin and proper meaning of this word, I consider the connection with *nunc* more probable than that with *ne*, and suppose that the challenging use (cf. St. 297, *nunc ultro id deportem?*) was the earlier, from which the neutral sense came by further loss of meaning. The later prevailing sense, expecting a negative answer, would then come from the challenging use, and the use in indirect questions would be descended from the neutral sense.

A third interrogative word, whose origin was apparently early, was *ec-* or *en*, associated always with the indefinites *quis* and *unquam*. Whatever may have been its original form, it was so largely used by Pl. that it can hardly have been a new word in his time, but it was a neutral word and came into competition with *ne*, so that even in Ter. its use had greatly decreased.

A third and very important step in the history of the interrogative sentence was the development of the particle *-nē*. From the locative *na-i* came three forms, *ne*, *nei*, *nī*, all containing already the negative idea, which came from the strong demonstrative idea ("that, not this"). For the negative see, among others, Ritschl, Opusc. II 622 ff., Ribbeck, Partik., 16 ff. While *nī* branched off with (negative) conditional sentences, *nē* became the earliest and most widely used negative, appearing in classical Latin in the conjunction, in *non*, etc. It did not originate a distinct form of question, but was introduced into a question already formed, the question in which the verb stood at the beginning. This was the most neutral kind of question, and every neutral question suggests a negation, is by its nature a wavering between affirmation and negation. Warren is wrong in the irony with which he says of Hand that he intrenches himself "behind the profound philosophical observation that every question implies doubt, and that all doubt borders upon negation, and that hence every question contains a negative element," p. 72; cf. Hand IV 71. No doubt Hand goes much too far in supposing that the negative was always felt in *-nē*, but the correctness of the general view that the interrogation and the negation are closely allied, psychologically, is placed beyond a doubt by Imme, II, p. 6 ff., and clearly recognized by Paul, p. 110. This negative element was more and more clearly felt, as the interrogative sentence swung away from the exclamation, until in the balanced, neutral question, with the verb at the beginning, it found expression in the negative word *ne*. Psychologically considered, such a question as *estne frater intus?* was almost the same thing as the later *est frater intus an non?*

Having thus found a place in the neutral question, *ne* lost by the law of association its proper negative force and became a neutral interrogative particle. It was thus fitted for a wider use as the sign of a question than *an* or *num*, and extended its sphere from the sentence which began with a verb to all forms of question which had not already some mark of interrogation, even to those in which the interrogative tone was very slight. In this way are to be explained the various kinds of exclamatory sentence with *ne*, *tun is eras?* *nuncin demum?* *egon dicam?* *ilan contemnor?* *eine ego ut advorser?* and the exclamatory infinitives *haecine te esse oblitum?* *mene efferre?* etc. This is also the reason why no certain line can be drawn between, e. g. *audisti* and *audistin*, between *est* and *estne*, *etiam* and *etiamne*. All these forms of sentence continued to exist alongside of the more distinct interrogation, and it was optional with the speaker in the time of Pl. to use the older form or to heighten somewhat the questioning tone of an exclamatory sentence by the use of *ne*. Yet this encroachment of the interrogation upon the exclamation was not unchecked, since of the 900 questions without a particle about nine-tenths are exclamatory. Finally, after *ne* became thoroughly neutralized, there was a further development of idioms out of the pure question, such as some of the uses of *ain*, *audin*, *viden*, *vin*, and especially the imperative questions, *abin*, *fugin*, etc.

The process by which *ne* became an interrogative particle is therefore essentially different from that which produced *an* and *num*. These were independent pronominal words which the interrogative-exclamatory inflection held at the beginning of the sentence, and which became interrogative when the sentence did; *ne* was introduced into an interrogative sentence that was already fully developed, as a fuller and, one might almost say, deliberate expression of the interrogation.

I am acquainted with only two sketches of the early history of *ne*. The first is by Probst, *Beiträge zur Lateinischen Grammatik*, II, pp. 135-6, given as an illustration of his general view that conjunctions get their meaning by association. After speaking of the forms *ne*, *nei*, *ni*, he says, "Wir verfolgen hier nur die Form 'ne' weiter. Diesem 'ne' assoziierte sich der Gedankeninhalt der Fragen, in denen es vorzugsweise verwendet wurde, d. h. es hatte bald *positiven*, bald *negativen* Sinn (Kühner, II, p. 1002). Beide Bedeutungen kamen dann auch offenbar durch Vermittlung der rhetorischen Fragen (d. s. Aussagen) in der *Aussage* zur Geltung.

So ergaben sich von einem einheitlichen Stamme zwei der Bedeutung nach verschiedene 'ne,' die der Herkunft nach jedoch nicht von einander zu trennen sind (vgl. Deecke in Bursian's Jahresberichten XXVIII 226 [should be 216]). Das *positive* 'ne' (nae) tritt noch z. B. in Verbindung mit 'edepol' u. ähnl. auf; aber auch in dem Sinne von 'etiam, nempe, enim' (Priscian II 101) oder von 'ergo' (Serv. zur Aen.), vgl. Minton Warren in American Journal of Philology II 5, 32, s. 8, 1881 [II 5, pp. 50 ff.], findet es sich. Das *negative* 'ne' zeigt sich z. B. in 'neque, nec, non (ne-oenum), neve' u. s. f. als einfache Negation oder negative Konjunktion." Taken in connection with the whole drift of the argument I suppose this to mean that *ne, nei, ni* was originally neutral, that *ne* got both negative and affirmative meanings in and through its use in questions, that both meanings passed from questions into declarative uses, and that *nē* the negative and conjunction is thus descended from *-nē* the interrogative particle. Not to dwell upon some obvious difficulties—e. g., it does not account for the negative sense of *ni*—the theory is sufficiently condemned by the fact that it leaves the Latin language without any negative at all until after the interrogative sentence was fully developed. The fact, of course, is that the negative sense of *nē* arose long before the time when language began to be written down.¹

The position taken by Professor Warren in the article referred to above is, on the other hand, perfectly clear, though it is merely suggested in the course of a paper devoted to other uses than the interrogative. He starts with the *egone si, hicine si* sentences, in which *ne* is apparently not interrogative. In this *ne* he sees the remnant of a supposed *nem*, an affirmative particle parallel to *nam* from the stem *na*, which passed over from declarative to interrogative sentences, especially exclamatory sentences like *egone ut, men* with the infin., etc. It did not come within the scope of Professor Warren's paper to fix precisely the limits of this use—"the interrogative use of the affirmative *nē*"—but the only form of question in which he clearly recognizes the negative *nē* is where *ne* seems to have the force of *nonne*. This theory has been accepted

¹ The third part of this essay (Leipzig, 1888) contains various remarks upon the interrogative sentence which I have not thought it worth while to refer to in detail. The history of *an*, pp. 238 ff., deserves mention for the confidence with which the author asserts that *an* was originally neutral in sense and was driven into a negative function (which it nowhere has) by the competition of *ne* and *nonne* (the latter of which did not come into existence till after the functions of *an* were fixed).

in whole by Dahl, VT, p. 299, and as to the non-interrogative sentences by Ribbeck on Mil. Glor. 309, Brix on the same (310) and doubtless by others.¹

I have tried to show above that the "*ne* = *nonne*" questions do not constitute a special class marked off by definite lines from other *ne*-questions; they indicate merely a use to which the neutral question was put, one of the idiomatic offshoots of the *ne*-question, like the impv. question. So *audin* "don't you hear?" *audin* "do you hear?" and *audin* "do you hear!" (impv.) are really one and the same phrase. If this is correct, then *nē* is no more negative in one *audin* than in the others; all contain the *ne* of negative origin, and the "*ne* = *nonne*" questions take their place with other idiomatic offshoots of the neutral question, from which they differ only by the fact that this sense is not strictly confined to *ne*-questions, and must therefore in part antedate the use of *ne*. My reasons for thinking that the *-nē* used in exclamations, *tun is eras? nuncin demum? men efferre . . .?* and the rest, is simply an extension of the interrogative use to partially interrogative sentences have been already given. In regard to all these forms of sentence Professor Warren seems to me to be following the scholiasts and grammarians too far. Their strength lies in statements of fact; in explanations they are weak. The statement of a grammarian that in a certain sentence he felt a shade of meaning which he expressed by *ergo* is to be received with respect; his explanation of this meaning as due to *ne* I look upon as a very natural error, especially if the same meaning appears in other sentences without *ne*. All the shades of meaning which Professor Warren illustrates by the *ne : ergo, ne : vero* glosses I should attribute to the order, the mood, the voice-inflection, more than to the single word *ne*; in short, this appears to me to be a case in which the sentence has influenced the meaning of the particle far more than the particle has influenced the sentence.

The question whether *ne* first entered the interrogative sentence through the "*ne* = *nonne*" question or through the neutral question

¹ Brix suggests another explanation, viz., that *-nē* in non-interrogative sentences may come from the affirmative *nē*, shortened and made enclitic. I venture to suggest a third hypothesis: as *nē* by association with neutral questions lost its negative force and became interrogative, so *-nē* by being used with an emphatic pronoun in exclamations was still further weakened into a particle of exclamatory emphasis, and could be used with *hicine, egone, tune* in sentences no longer interrogative. The word "affirmative" does not quite express the idea.

is less important, since it must in either case have been extended at once to all sentences with the verb at the beginning. But if it began in the neutral question, it is easy to see how it lost its negative force, while in a question with the effect of *nonne* it would tend strongly to retain a distinct negative force. Further, a true *nonne*-question is a negative sentence turned into a question; it has a corresponding negative declarative sentence, *non audio, non dixi*. But *dixin* is a question into which a negative has entered, and corresponds to *dixi*, not to *non dixi*. The position, also, of *ne* after the verb seems to distinguish these sentences from the earliest form of the negative question, in which *non* comes at the beginning and the verb at the end.

The fourth step in the history of questions resulted in several minor forms of sentence, and in one which afterward had wide use. This was the *non, nonne* question. It has already been shown that the distinction between the negative exclamation and the negative question corresponds to a difference in the position of *non*, and that the question has *non* at the beginning and the verb at the end. As *non* retained its independence and its negative meaning, *ne* could not be used with it until *ne* had itself lost its negative sense. For this reason, as well as because the *non*-question was itself of late origin, *nonne* was just beginning in the time of Pl. and is infrequent in Ter. Later, when the logical forms of the literary language crushed out the free natural growths, *nonne* played a great part in the interrogative sentence.

Imme points out (II, pp. 21, 26) the considerable influence which words of precision (Fragewörter der Bestimmtheit) have upon questions. German examples are *jetzt, immer, noch, je*; the most evident case in Latin is *num*, but to this class I should assign *etiam*, especially with imperative force, and the few cases of *iam* mentioned above. Like the German *wirklich*, English *really, actually*, are the cases of *ilane* in which *ita* has lost its standard of comparison; *satin* is even clearer, and is an excellent illustration on a small scale of the making of an interrogative particle. Of course these are not like *an*, since the interrogative force lay from the beginning in *ne*, but the gradual change of meaning from "enough" to "really, actually" shows that in sentences like *satin abiit?* *satin* was no longer felt as a compound, but had become little more than a particle.

In all these cases the same linguistic impulse is still at work that produced *an* and *num*; but in the time of Pl. this impulse

spent its force, and from this time on no new particles were brought into use.

While the question had thus been developing various forms to express various shades of meaning, the exclamatory sentence had at no time ceased to be used, though it had, perhaps owing to its kinship with the declarative sentence, been less prolific in evolving special forms. We might perhaps regard some of the interjections as signs of the exclamation, and certainly *nempe*, *fortasse*, *videlicet*, *credo* performed at times the function of indicating a hesitating assertion. The sentence with *cesso* also maintained itself as an idiom without *ne*; possibly it is raised into unnatural prominence, as *videon* certainly is, by the recurrence of a particular dramatic situation. The examples of the exclamation will be found mostly under IV.

As the exclamation is akin to the repetition, it often suggests rejection or repudiation. In this way the pronominal questions under I. B, either with or without *ne*, retain much of the exclamatory force, because they take up for question some single idea already suggested. They pass over the main idea as correct, and settle down with all the force of contrast upon one thing, questioning that alone with a severity which suggests a doubt of its correctness.

All the forms of question thus far enumerated grew out of the exclamatory-declarative sentence; from the sentence of will there came a similar but much less extended development. The mark of this kind of sentence, so far as questions are concerned, is the subjunctive.

The deliberative question, addressed by the speaker to himself, corresponds to the indicative question with the verb at the beginning, and like that may have *ne*; it is a simple question in regard to the speaker's intention or ability, and the subjunctive retains so much of its future force as to be in single cases indistinguishable from a future.

A sentence which expresses a wish, an exhortation, a command, that is, the will of another person, is not in itself questioning, but exclamatory. I have already shown that the forms in the 1st pers., which are the only ones at all noteworthy, follow all but invariably an impv. or some other expression of willing, and are closely allied to repetitions. In fact *dic. || dicam?* is simply an exclamatory repetition with the necessary change of person, and, except for the mood, exactly like *dixisti. || dixi?* That is, the

repudiation is due to the exclamatory repetition; all that the mood does is to direct the repudiation upon the will. The simplest form, e. g., *abi. || abeam?* is found, but this is more frequently, and with *ne* invariably, used for deliberative questions. In repudiation it is almost instinctive to add an interrogative or a pronoun or both, as in English, though it is possible to express this idea in a single word with peculiar circumflex accent ("speak! || spēāk?"), it is more natural to add some further words. All the interrogatives may be used, as with the indic. Compare Aul. 652, *certe habes. || habeo ego? quid habeo?* with Bacch. 406, *sequare. || quo sequar?* Bacch. 630, *habe bonum animum. || unde habeam?* Eun. 610, *muta vestem. || ubi mutem?* There is no real difference between *quo, ubi, unde* in these sentences, and *ut* in Amph. 694, *te ut deludam contra . . .?* But the form with *ut* alone is not frequent; generally the pronoun is added to *dicam* or *ut dicam*, either alone or with *ne*. Cf. *egon* with the indic. And as in English these sentences are expressed by a circumflex accent upon both words, so in Latin the ordinary position of *egon* before *ut* shows that it was not fully incorporated into the sentence. When *ne* is used with these forms of exclamation, it expresses the nearest approach to a real question. For an unemotional questioning of the will of another person, a leading verb in the indic. must be introduced. So Aul. 634, *redde huc sis. || quid tibi vis reddam?* Most. 578, *gere modum . . . || quid tibi ego vis geram?* are to be regarded as extensions of *quid reddam, geram?* in the direction of unemotional questioning.

What is remarkable, therefore, in these much discussed questions ("die unwilligen oder missbilligenden Fragen") is the convergence upon them of two lines of influence, the mood, by which they express will, and the exclamatory repetition, which makes them repudiating.¹

While it is plain that *ut* is interrogative in these questions and similar to *quid, unde, ubi*, there is in questions with *utine* the difficulty that this involves the use of *-ne* with an interrogative. This anomaly is rare and late, occurring only once (Trin. 1095) in Pl., and not at all in Ter. If the *utine* questions are put by the side

¹ Kraz, die sog. unwillige oder misbilligende Frage, Stuttgart, 1862; Müller, same title, Görlitz, 1875; cf. Schnoor, zum Gebrauch von *ut* bei Pl., Neumünster, 1885, p. 3. A discussion of the mood in these questions would be profitless until the subjunctive in declarative sentences in Pl. and Ter. has been more thoroughly studied.

of *quaene*, *quodne*, *quiane* and other relatives, it will be seen that the kinship is hardly less close than that with *ut*, both in form (except for the mood) and in repudiating effect. The explanation I take to be this: The change from parataxis to hypotaxis is the result, not so much of the putting together of two complete sentences, as of the prefixing of an introductory verb to the clause which thus became subordinate. Thus *ne id accidat* was the original portion, and *timeo* was a prefixed introduction, an expression of the total intention of the clause; so *quid negoti est (sit) ?* was an exclamatory repetition to which *rogas* was prefixed. This leading verb, the expression of a greater precision, struggled slowly up from unconsciousness to consciousness and expression, and there must have been a time with every construction which passed from parataxis to hypotaxis, when the idea of the leading verb was partially felt and could be expressed or omitted. Many illustrations of this may be found in Pl. and Ter., e. g., with *ain*, *audin*, *rogas*, and cf. *vis reddam*, above. At this point stood the *ut* questions, descended evidently and immediately from *ut* interrogative, but with a faint consciousness that greater precision required an introductory verb, and therefore just on the point of changing from *ut* interrogative to *ut* relative. This is the reason why these clauses with *utine* so closely resemble *quodne*, *quiane*, *quamne*, and also the reason why Pl., to whom *ne* after an interrogative was strange, could use *ne* with *ut*. Only half the truth is expressed by classing *utine* questions with relatives, as I have done, or by calling *ut* the Interrogativum-rhetoricum (Probst, p. 150); it partakes of the nature of both.

The differences between Pl. and Ter are not as great as might be expected. The slighter differences, such as may often be found between two authors of the same period, have been noted as they came up, e. g., the greater frequency in Ter. of the 1st pers. pres. except *sum*, of *ain ? pergin*, *itane*, etc. Two points only deserve special mention. In the first place, Ter. uses the exclamatory forms more frequently than Pl. So of repetitions of all kinds, including *rogas*, *rogitas*, he has almost as many cases in six plays as Pl. has in twenty, showing especial fondness for single verbs like *tenes ? nostin ?* etc., as well as for the infin. In the second place, Ter. employs with *ne* a much greater variety of questions than Pl., e. g., a greater number of verbs in the 1st pers. pres., more verbs in unusual tenses, a much greater variety of adjectives and nouns, more pronouns in other cases than the nominative.

These two tendencies indicate a widening distance between the exclamation and the question, which had been originally one. The exclamatory effect was going out of the question, and therefore Ter. used distinctively exclamatory forms where Pl. would have felt a sufficient exclamatory force in the question. And, on the other hand, the question was becoming stereotyped, and the questioning force seemed more and more to reside in the particles, especially in *ne*, so that the particle could carry interrogative effect into any form of sentence. The reign of the particle was beginning. This I suppose to be the ordinary course of evolution; the tendencies to variation become fixed in species, and the intermediate forms, the connecting links, drop out of existence.

QUESTIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR FUNCTIONS.

The principle seems to be generally adopted in our manuals of Latin grammar that language is best presented to the student from the psychological side. Therefore we have conditional clauses, final clauses, even concessive clauses, rather than *si* clauses, *ut* clauses, *qui* clauses. Carrying this idea over into interrogative sentences, it has been the custom to divide them into questions for information, questions expecting a negative answer, and questions expecting an affirmative answer. This three-fold division has doubtless had some support from its general coincidence with the particles *ne*, *num*, and *nonne*, and it has also, unfortunately, reacted upon our conception of the meaning and uses of these particles, narrowing them too strictly within logical limits.

As a partial corrective of this too mechanical classification I have thought it worth while to call attention to the two excellent programs by Th. Imme, *Die Fragesätze nach psychologischen Gesichtspunkten eingeteilt und erläutert*, Cap. I-III, Cleve, 1879, Cap. IV-VI, 1881. In the first is given a general study of the interrogation with a discussion of the pronominal questions (*Bestimmungsfragen*). In the second the author classifies the varieties of sentence-question (*Bestätigungsfragen*), using for illustration mainly German, Greek and English examples. I give here a brief outline of the second program with illustrations from Pl. and Ter.¹

¹ Aside from their special object these programs are worth reading as illustrating the definite and valuable results which may be obtained from the combination of psychology and philology.

Questions differ according to the proportions in which they contain two distinct lines of thought. In the first place, when the mind conceives an idea imperfectly or dimly, or when an idea once clearly grasped is rendered uncertain by the presentation to the mind of a new idea inconsistent with the first, then the effort to attain to clearness and certainty takes the form of a question, especially if there be another person present. In the second place, there may co-exist in the mind at the same time with the uncertainty a somewhat distinct opinion in regard to the matter which is the subject of the question. According to the proportions in which these two elements are present Imme makes five grades of sentence-question.

1. Questions of awakened interest (or der aufstrebenden Erkenntniss), in which only the first element is present. These are the pure questions, questions for information, in regard to matters about which the speaker could not have any opinion. They are very rare in 1st pers., and not frequent in 2d pers. All forms of *stipulatio*, *habeon rem pactam* ? *sponden*, *dabin*, come in this class, and such forms as *ain*, *audin*, *viden*, *scin*, *vin*, with direct object ; also *cognoscin*, *esne*, *haben*, *ludin*, *valen*. Almost all 3d persons are of this kind, *est(ne) frater domi* ? either with or without *ne*, and most cases of nouns, adjectives and adverbs with *ne*. So also many cases of *num*, *numquis adest* ? *numquid de Dacis audisti* ? (Hor.) and some few cases of *an* approach this sense.

2. Questions of doubt (Zweifelfragen) are not the dubitative or deliberative questions with the subjunctive, but questions where the speaker's previous opinion has been shaken by some sudden thought, so that he is thrown from certainty into doubt. Cases in which no trace of the previous opinion appears are infrequent ; generally it shows itself in a leaning in one direction or the other, and according as the previous opinion was negative or affirmative, the question will lean toward the affirmative or the negative. From this result the two kinds of doubt-questions, those which expect an affirmative and those which expect a negative answer, or, as Imme calls them, yes-questions and no-questions. Examples of yes-questions, which should regularly contain a negative word, are cases of *non* at the beginning of the sentence with the verb at the end, *nonne*, *ne* with the effect of *nonne*, and the few cases without a particle which have *nonne* force. Imme's distinction between *non* and *nonne* is incorrect for Pl. and Ter. These are

all rather clearly marked, because the previous opinion, being negative, was distinguished by some clearly negative word. But there is no single word to express affirmation, and no-questions are therefore expressed in a great variety of ways. Words which express actuality or existence may mark a strong affirmation, and therefore in a question may indicate a leaning toward negation. Such are *itane vero*, *satin* in some meanings, verbs of thinking and believing like *credin*, *censen*, words expressing a moral or aesthetic standard like *sanun*, *duasne uxores habet*, *rufamne illam virginem* (Heaut. 1061), etc. Words of restriction or definition are still more frequent; *num*, *iam* and *etiam* in some cases, perhaps *adeon* and other demonstrative words, though these pass over into more distinct rejection. Even the circumstances, without the help of any one word, may so restrict the possible answers as to leave only a negative answer open, e. g. *repelon quem dedi*? Out of all these ways of expressing doubt of an affirmative opinion only *num* clearly assumed the function of an interrogative particle, though *etiam* came very near doing so.

3. Questions of certainty. In these the second element, the opinion previously held, becomes still more prominent, and only so much of the question is left as expresses a wish for assent from the person addressed. Special forms of this are questions with *nempe*, *videlicet*, *fortasse*, *credo*, and other illustrations may be found among questions without a particle having the verb at the end (IV. H.) Imme compares οὐκοῦν. When the assent is doubtful, this kind of question may be highly emotional, and many kinds of exclamation and repetition lie in the borderland between this class and the next, and may be used in either way.

4. Questions of repudiation or rejection, in which the previous opinion is so strong that the question is asked only to be at once repudiated or rejected. Here belong most forms of question with demonstrative or personal pronouns, many cases with *an*, and many repetitions, exclamations and supplementary questions. For the most part the questioning effect is so slightly felt that *ne* is not used with them.

Imme makes also a separate division for pedagogic questions, but with these Plautus was happily unacquainted.

5. Rhetorical questions. In these the question has sunk away to a mere form; in the mind of the speaker there is no question, nor does he suppose that there will be any question in the mind of the hearer, but he uses the question form only to express with

greater vividness the thought which instantly rises, as an answer, in the mind of the hearer. The only rhetorical questions at all frequent in the comedy are the imperative questions and the closely allied uses of *scin*, *viden*, *vin* as introductions to the main thought. Imme seems to me to go much too far in attempting to draw sharp distinctions between rhetorical questions and questions used rhetorically.

The rhetorical question should be distinguished as to origin from the emotional or exclamatory question; the exclamation is one of the oldest varieties of question, in a sense the source of all other forms, while the rhetorical question is a late offshoot from the fully developed question through degeneration and loss of meaning.

This outline of Imme's program may serve to illustrate the difficulties of a classification of questions according to function. All such classification introduces the delicate problem of determining just how much of its original sense may be still felt in a phrase which has been long in use. At the same time it shows the great variety of uses to which a single form of question may be put, and the large extension of usage which has taken place in regard to some kinds of interrogative sentence. The question having the verb with *ne*, for example, is found in all five classes, and even in both subdivisions of doubt-questions, and of the forms in general use in the time of Plautus hardly one is confined to a single function. Especially in no-questions the great variety of shadings in interrogative sentences is well illustrated (Imme treats this at great length), and the extreme difficulty of fixing the meaning of the sentence upon a single word is very apparent.

E. P. MORRIS.